DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 377 099 SO 024 315

TITLE	Informal Meeting of Experts on Education Indicators (Paris, France, January 31-February 5, 1991). Report.
INSTITUTION	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Paris (France).
REPORT NO	ED.91/CONF.611/2
PUB DATE	7 Mar 91
NOTE	13p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Comparative Education; Developing Nations; *Educational Development; *Educational Improvement; *Educational Quality; Educational Research; Educational Status Comparison; *Measurement; *Measurement Techniques
IDENTIFIERS	*Educational Indicators; *United Nations

ABSTRACT

The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) held a meeting of experts on education indicators to discuss the role of these indicators in the 1991 World Education Report as well as future issues concerning education indicators. The meeting was opened by the chairperson with a review of the usefulness of indicators in providing summary measures of the state of education in the world and in individual nations. The group discussed desirable traits of education indicators. The need for the measurement of actual learning, rather than simple attendance was highlighted as well as the need to measure teachers' contributions and roles in the report. The discussion then focused on the value of individual indicators and UNESCO's overall measurement strategy. A general debate included the following areas: (1) coverage; (2) framework; (3) presentation; (4) number of indicators used; (5) disparities; (6) vulnerable groups; (7) illiteracy; (8) issues related to language and script; (9) learning outcomes and efficiency; (10) projections; (11) book and textbook production; (12) enrollment ratios; (13) teacher supply; (14) transition rates; and (15) meaning of public/private distinction. Presentations followed on educational indicator work done by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). The meeting concluded with a discussion on future UNESCO work on education indicators and a suggestion for a similar forum be held in regard to the 1993 World Education Report. (CK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 377 099

Informal Meeting of Experts on Education Indicators

Paris, 31 January - 5 February 1991

REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
F. ZANOLTINNI

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 024 315

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UNESCO

ED.91/CONF.611/2

1—4

Informal Meeting of Experts on Education Indicators
Paris, 31 January - 5 February 1991

REPORT

The meeting was opened by Mr Carceles, Director, Division of Statistics, who chaired the meeting. Mr Power, Assistant Director-General for Education and Mr Smyth, Co-ordinator of the World Education Report, 1991 also participated.

Mr Carceles opened the meeting by telling the group what UNESCO's general aspirations were in the field of educational indicators and UNESCO's expectations as regards this meeting. He said they were looking for advice from the group about the role of such indicators both in the 1991 World Education Report currently being produced and in future issues. They were also looking for advice on the long-term prospects of further development of the indicators for use in a variety of situations expecially in relation to priority programmes of UNESCO. It was hoped that the indicators would also be useful to persons concerned with planning and investment in education. They would be part of a wider data-base available in UNESCO. He hoped that the indicators developed would provide a guide to member countries particularly developing countries in creating their own indicators to help locate their problems in a comparative setting in order to monitor their progress towards solving these problems.

Mr Power said that UNESCO looked to an indicator system to tell "what was going on in education" in summary form and to provide a guide to the policy issues which both international agencies and individual countries faced. The indicators should be "doable", affordable and relate to the real situation. In so far as was feasible within cost limits, they should provide information about the quality of learning as well as about participants in activities designed to foster learning and should if possible have a diagnostic role. The participants should analyse the strengths and weaknesses of the current approach to educational indicators, should identify the priorities for future development and could usefully consider the relationship of these indicators to those in other fields. He pointed out that indicators were necessarily used in political debate both at national and international level and said that the indicators should be robust enough to be able to survive the criticism which such debate usually engendered. Finally he referred to the work that OECD had done in this area and said that UNESCO looked forward to benefitting from this work.

Indicators for the World Education Report

Mr Smyth then introduced the UNESCO approach to the 1991 World Education Report. He identified some of the key concerns of the report such as a newly intensified preoccupation with the extent to which children actually learned some of the things which educators felt they ought to learn, as distinct from simply participating in organized schooling or other teaching/learning situations. He also

-7 MARS 1991

said that the report would emphasize the critical role of the teacher, who was not simply another resource input, one more expensive and less easily replaced where necessary than other resources. He asked whether the revised stress on the importance of the classroom teacher was adequately reflected in the current indicators and suggested that they would need modifications in this area. He drew attention to the variety of audiences which they hoped to reach and the need to cater as far as possible to the special needs of these audiences.

Mr Hyland introduced the discussion paper and drew attention to the fact that two macro-issues need to be addressed a substantive one as to what indicators should be modified or dropped and what new indicators should be added and a more general one of evaluating the current UNESCO approach and proposing and evaluating alternative approaches either as complementary or competitive to the present approach. He pointed out that any alternative approach had cost implications.

The meeting was then opened for debate on general issues. The following topics were discussed.

Coverage: A number of participants expressed concern that the indicators did not cover what they referred to as non-formal education. They expressed the view that this was an important and perhaps growing aspect of education and gave a number of examples in many countries. They raised the question of how it might be covered in the future. The Secretariat pointed out that efforts to collect data on these activities had been made and had not been successful due to the non-availability of data at the national level. The great variety of programmes covered by the term non-formal also created problems. However, it was agreed that the issue must be reopened.

Framework: A number of participants stressed the need for a satisfactory theoretical framework as a basis for the identification of gaps in the indicator set and of discussing priorities for improvement. The form which such a framework should preferably take (e.g. whether formal models of an education system should be used or not) and the need for UNESCO to avoid anything which might freeze thinking about a vast variety of unpredictable problems and perceptions about these problems were discussed.

Mr Nuttall while stressing the need for a framework informed the meeting tht the original 4-way framework (i.e. Environment, Resources, Process and Output) adopted by the OECD as an organizing schema was under reconsideration and was unlikely to survive in that form; an agreed alternative was not yet available. Mr Wiley suggested the use of a system of categories relating to essential functions of any organized education/schooling system; he referred to five headings: Pre-conditions of a schooling system; Resources required, distinguishing those capable of being designated in terms of a currency and others of a different type such as parental or administrative attitudes; Service Provision, distinguishing organizational aspects linked to Resource allocation from the delivery of services to clients; Participation by clients identifying such items as time spent as well as more traditional items and Outcomes, distinguishing learning achievements from immediate and long-term destination, including in this item participation not only in the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

labour force but in other key aspects of society. He pointed out that a system of this type could set an agenda for development. Mr Smyth pointed out that an implicit set of categories for organizing and evaluating the adequacy of the set of indicators was provided by the structure of the World Education Report and the issues highlighted in it. Apart from the question of a formal framework, participants discussed alternative criteria for creating and rejecting indicators. One proposal was that three basic determinants should be used (a) policy relevance, (b) compatibility with an agreed conceptual framework and (c) feasibility, it being recognized that feasibility had many elements, especially quality; cost; time. Another participant proposed a different way of organizing indicators. He believed they could be classified by (a) role in monitoring policy and identifying the need for changes; (b) guidelines as to the direction in which changes needed to be made and (c) help in monitoring the consequences of reforms.

Presentation: Many participants felt that the impact of the World Education Report and related sets of indicators would be greatly enhanced if economic and demographic indicators from other UN Organisations were included to provide summary data on the wider situation in each country. The feeling of the meeting was that the gain from reproducing other indicators in conjunction with educational indicators was likely to be so great that the matter should be considered by the Secretariat.

Number of indicators used: The above issue and the Secretariat reaction to some other specific suggestions, led to a general discussion of the appropriate target size for the indicator section of the report and the problem of trade-offs. It was felt that the criterion of size tended to avoid facing the issues of priorities in a formal way and had underlying conservative implications, in that it led to the repeated inclusion of indicators shown in previous years, at the expense of new options.

Disparities: There was a widespread feeling at the meeting that it would be desirable to show disparities within countries as well as averages; a number of preliminary proposals were made. It was however widely recognized that a deeper consideration of the possibilities was required and that the item would be taken up again under Item 4 of the agenda.

Vulnerable groups: Apart from the general issue of disparities, many participants felt that indicators illustrating the situation of vulnerable or disadvantaged groups, including women in some countries, within the more general society would be highly desirable. Several suggestions were made.

Illiteracy: Compared with other disadvantaged persons and groups, the problems of persons who were functionally illiterate (and probably innumerate as well) had a special call on the attention of UNESCO. The feeling was that while current indicators in this field were useful it would be desirable to expand the coverage of this item. Many participants felt that rates of illiteracy should be shown for specific age groups of particular interest. One participant suggested that cohort analysis would help to illustrate the dynamics of the situation as well as showing the effects (if any) of particular programmes.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Issues related to Language and Script: A number of participants pointed out that the variety of languages, and in some cases scripts, used within particular countries posed a great challenge for already hard-pressed educational authorities. Such challenges were not always adequately met. It would be desirable to have indicators illustrating the challenge and where available the extent and adequacy or otherwise of the response. The Secretariat pointed out that data on some aspects of this issue were being collected in the special one-off questionnaire recently issued on Basic Education. Data would not be available for the 1991 World Education Report but might well be available for the 1993 World Education Report.

Learning Outcomes and Efficiency: A number of participants raised a variety of problems in these fields. It was recognised that the wider issue of measuring the extent and patterns of actual learning outcomes was a formidable task and would need to be discussed again following the presentation of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). However, attendance at school, as distinct from enrolment, was one vital aspect of this problem and some participants felt that an indicator to highlight this issue was essential. The Secretariat pointed out that it appeared that very few countries had data on this matter but that they would reinvestigate the issue. A number of possibilities for further indicators to show various aspects of the efficiency of school systems were mentioned but it was not evident that a better suggestion than the existing indicator was available.

Projections: It was agreed that it was not desirable to use the formal indicator structure to attempt to summarize the results of projection studies carried out by UNESCO. It was agreed also that it would be essential to draw attention to the salient aspects of such studies in the report, perhaps confining identification of particular countries to acute situations.

Book and Textbook Production: An extensive discussion took place on these issues. There were at least three interrelated issues and data on Production of new titles covered only a limited part of the question. The number of actual books produced, as well as import and export of books by language/cultural categories was also relevant. As well as data on books generally it would be highly desirable to have data on text-books, preferably by level and by subject, at secondary and higher levels. The position as regards school libraries was also relevant. The Secretariat pointed out that attempts to collect such data had been made with very little success. Some participants felt that it was as important to highlight the absence of data in these key fields as it was to present one or two items of the very limited data available.

Enrolment ratios: The possibility of using age-specific enrolment ratios (ASER) in various ways, to show ASER at critical ages; to identify the modal age and measures of dispersion both at the expected intake age and for primary (or basic) education generally, was canvassed. One participant expressed a willingness to look at the data available to UNESCO and make further specific suggestions. Support for the suggestion made at para. 4a of the discussion paper was expressed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sundry specific points: A number of important specific points were made in addition to the above, some methodological and some substantive. Among the former were suggestons as to the use of household surveys, the use of micro-data and of population censuses as ways of collecting educationally relevant data capable of being presented in indicator form, particularly on such topics as activity in the "non-formal" area, which could not be got through institutional-based questionnaires. In another intervention the question of how quantitative judgements, recognized as playing an important role in educational decision-making could be reflected in indicator presentation was raised. This was related to the concern expressed by some participants that the indicator system should if possible not only identify critical problems but should illustrate why such problems occurred.

The possibility of presenting indicators created by using number of institutions or schools was canvassed. The Secretariat acknowledged that such data were collected and that such indicators would be desirable but were fearful that the quality of the data provided would not sustain indicators of adequate quality. This led to a general discussion of the problem of using minimum standards of quality and reliability to eliminate particular indicators, to censor or footnote particular entries; to provide information of a contextual kind to help sophisticated interpreters and to prevent naive misinterpretations. Several instances of probable incompatiblity were pointed out. The Secretariat expressed willingness to consider these issues.

The Secretariat promised to consider all of these suggestions constructively and sympathetically, insofar as available data and resources allowed. Extensive and detailed discussions then took place on each of the Tables I to VI, including the possibility of expanding and reorganizing the Tables to the limits allowed by the Co-ordinator of the World Education Report, and in other contexts.

These discussions are not covered in detail in this presentation apart from some specific items mentioned below, as the Secretariat indicated that they interpreted the feeling of the meeting to accord priority to some suggested changes over other suggestions. They promised to pay particular attention to these priority suggestions, (a) in modifying what will be presented in the 1991 World Education Report subject to time limitations and (b) in a wider and less constrained context of the 1993 and following editions of the World Education Report, and in other contexts.

Special issues

Teacher supply: It was regarded as not feasible to illustrate the full dynamics of teacher supply in the indicator system for obvious reasons, but some key indicators could usefully be presented. One, to illustrate the relative constraints on the availability of teachers of good quality might consist of showing the ratio of number of teachers to one or several aspects of the adult population or the labour force. The following possibilities were canvassed; the literate adult population, the non-agricultural labour force, the total labour force. It was also felt to be desirable to identify the number of third level students classified as in the field of "Education", as a focus

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

indicator particularly relevant to the World Education Report. The possibilitites of misleading readers because of various incomparabilities in structures leading to becoming a teacher as well as other incompatibilitites based on changing conditions as regards the supply and demand for teachers were mentioned. On balance it seemed worthwhile to provide this indicator.

Transition rates: Participants enquired why transition rates from completed primary to secondary and from completed secondary to third level were not included in the indicators. The Secretariat indicated that the former, if not the latter, were always considered each time the revision of the set of indicators was discussed, but that difficulties in the data provided by a number of important countries inhibited the Secretariat from including these indicators. Following an extensive discussion the feeling of the meeting was that an indicator expressing the transition from primary to secondary should be provided even if data for certain important countries was not suitable to allow them to be included.

Meaning of public/private distinction: A number of participants drew attention to ambiguities in the interpretation of this distinction. In particular it was not clear how schools which were legally private, but which were financed predominantly from public funds (including the payment of all or part of teacher salaries) were expected to be handled by individual countries. It was recognized that very little could be done to clarify the situation for the 1991 World Education Report, but that further work to clarify the situation both as regards the creation of a sensible paradigm to handle the issue and to discover country practice should be done.

Modification of standard questionnaire to identify more accurately the position as regards compulsory attendance

It was pointed out that the question on compulsory attendance in the standard questionnaire was not adequate to identify the position in countries or component parts of member states which did not define their regulations in terms of, or exclusively in terms of, age. In addition, those cases where compulsory part-time enrolment in schools (sometimes as part of a "co-op" or a "dual" system) was required following the completion of full-time compulsory enrolment was also not covered adequately. Finally some participants pointed out that the implementation of these regulations differed significantly from country to country, and perhaps within countries, and that data on the degree of implementation would be essential to understand the actual role that compulsion as such played in each country. The Secretariat acknowledged that the questionnaire should be reviewed on this issue.

Overview of OECD work in the area of education indicators

The Chairman of the Meeting, G. Nascimento, Chief, Section of Statistics on Education, Division of Statistics, gave the floor to Mr Nuttall who is a member of the Co-ordinating Group (COG) for the OECD Project and who provided information on the OECD activities. In his presentation he distinguished between organizational matters, expected scientific outcomes and the expected products of these activities at the end of the second phase, now reaching a climax. Mr Nuttall identified five problems he sees emerging from these activities: the

implications for the work UNESCO had already undertaken on the revision of ISCED; the need to maintain cohesion between the work of the various groups and networks to whom responsibility for particular areas had been devolved; the time and money required for the enterprise and the need to maintain the interest of sponsors over an extended period; the special problems concerned with the measurement of student outcomes and the way of handling variations in country interpretations of the templates and other key documents.

A wide range of questions, most of them of a clarificatory nature, followed. In reply Mr Nuttall provided additional insights on the OECD activities as they unfolded over time. The Chairman raised three questions. How might the OECD work be used by UNESCO in its ongoing concern with improving the situation including information to and about developing countries; how these activities were seen as interfacing with the regular joint collection of educational statistics and in relation to the work already initiated on the revision of ISCED; what the best basis for co-operation with OECD might be. Mr Nuttall offered some thoughts on these topics and said that he felt sure that OECD valued and wished to continue the ongoing co-operation in data collection with UNESCO and EUROSTAT. He referred to the opportunity the project gave for learning from country experience and the stimulus it gave the countries to resolve festering issues in the area of international comparability. He pointed out that at present the statistical data needed to calculate the indicators were collected from countries and the calculation of the indicators as such was done by OECD. He expressed the view that many even well informed people tended to expect too much from an indicator system. In his view a good indicator system would direct attention to problem areas or to areas with special potential. It would then be necessary for the concerned authorities to collect additional information before deciding on necessary action. What was necessary now in the context of the OECD project was to decide what could usefully be done in the short term. Mr Smyth raised the question whether any way could be found of expediting the revision of ISCED. A number of participants raised the question how the INES project intended to handle the issue of non-formal and informal educational and training activities. Mr Nuttall informed them that the OECD project was primarily concerned with the formal system, at least during this phase of the work, though it did in principle cover adult education and related activities also.

A general discussion followed of the role of non-formal and informal education in developing countries, and of ways of clarifying the ambiguities to which the term "non-formal" in particular gives rise. One participant suggested that it would help resolve some of these difficulties if we could list the various types of activities covered by these terms and subsequently develop a classification system which would enable us to refer to them without ambiguity; identify the salient aspects of each sub-system and in due course collect data on them in a more systematic manner. We need to know for each sub-system what the variants of service provision are and what the term participant means in context. Identification and classification of institutional mechanisms that deliver services and allocate resources could also make a useful contribution. Another participant stressed the extremely wide range of activities covered by the term and saw it as essentially a basket term: everything dealing with designed

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

learning not allocated to the regular school and college system fell into it. He felt that we already knew enough from previous studies and reports to use existing classification patterns. Other participants disagreed and expressed the view that no cohesive category system existed which allowed activities to be placed unambiguously and that a suitable structure was necessary to underpin systematic data collection and analysis.

Another participant suggested that a functional structure using goal and content as a basis was a necessary aspect of any viable classification system. One of the problems of overall classification of educational activities was that the same activity might be regarded as non-formal education in one country and as part of the regular system in another. The Secretariat referred to surveys done in some countries and said that while they collected a great deal of information it was hard to identify systematic patterns or to present the data in meaningful summary fashion due to the diversity of the terminology used and of the basic structures encountered. The point was also made that some of the relevant activities were multipurpose and could not easily be classified by goal. The suggestion was made that regional offices might be asked to collect some data on non-formal education using existing questionnaires as a pragmatic way of increasing information about the activities concerned. The question of what individual countries had done and what they were regularly publishing about these activities was also raised.

Mr Plank, at the invitation of the Chairman, outlined the developments in one of the OECD key group "Costs and Expenditure". He indicated that the group initially covered costs and resources but that the item "resources" was hived off and allocated to another network leaving Costs and Finance to the technical group (TG2). Mr Plank outlined the rationale for each indicator on the list and invited questions. The Chairman advised participants not to go to the fine detail of each indicator but to confine themselves to indicating areas needing further research. A spirited debate took place on the role that budgetary estimates as distinct from actual appropriations made should play and it was mentioned that the Secretariat was looking into this matter. Other points raised included the problems of distinguishing public from private sources of funds; the effect of using national accountancy criteria in presenting financial data for the education sector and the question how the boundaries of expenditure classified as education should be specified.

The group then turned its attention to making detailed suggestions for the improvement of Table 7. Mr Plank complimented the Secretariat on the effort they had made to address the issues and expressed some concern about the way flows of funds especially from international organizations to countries and from one country to another were handled. He would support a cautious move to improve existing questionnaires and praised the initiative taken by UNESCO towards the revision of ISCED.

Overview of IEA work

Mr Wiley gave an introduction on the work of IEA over the last years in measuring student outcomes. He specified the various policy decisions taken by that enquiry. He identified some of the strengths

and weaknesses of the approach and indicated that IEA was moving to reduce the long delay in getting out the results of studies. A lively discussion followed on ways in which poorer countries could be enabled to participate in IEA studies.

Future UNESCO work on indicators

Concerning the need for of a conceptual framework as a basis for future work, varied views were expressed, one of the key issues being the danger that an overt model, or even a formal category system, might freeze the development of the Indicator System and influence the flexibility of the World Education Report. One basis of the different perceptions related to the extent to which it was desirable or feasible to create and use a category system which looked beyond present policy and associated programmes and targets. Those who advocated the identification and use of a formal category system felt that this was (a) feasible without detracting from its usefulness in serving current policy preoccupations and (b) desirable as experience showed that the priorities for policy changed over time and that a useful informational system and its derived indicator systems, had to be robust enough to be still relevant in a new policy context.

They pointed out also that if it were necessary to design and implement a new information system following each major policy shift, there would be long delays in putting such a system in place and getting sufficient time-series on the new basis; that almost all programs set up to implement new policies would probably have been changed before they could be monitored in any overall systematic way. They pointed out that any systematic approach to identifying gaps as well as low priority items in an indicator system depended on the availability of a suitable category system. Those who took the view that information structures had to be closely tailored to policy priorities conceeded some of the above points, but preferred to have a statistical information system which operated within an incompletely formalized structure and in a sense responsive to intuitive perceptions of the need and priorities for change as policy changed.

In asking Mr Hyland to introduce the discussion paper on this item, the Chairman pointed out that many of the topics had already been covered to a considerable extent in the general discussion. He hoped that additional perspectives would emerge. Mr Hyland said it was desirable to envisage sustained dialogue between decision makers particularly those who critically influenced the allocation of money to producers of services and hence by implication to clients on the one hand and those responsible for the design and implementation of information on the other. It was essential especially at the international level, to engage in a vigourous dialogue between decision makers and information system designers.

He said that decision makers used words and phrases which in the specific but implicit context in which the phrases were used frequently implied rather precise concepts and sometimes even a close range of operational options. The same phrases used in different specific contexts frequently referred to quite different concepts and operational options. He referred to the various interpretations of the phrase "functional literacy" as an example of this situation. It is necessary therefore for those articulating long-term information

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

needs to be in close dialogue with information designers at critical decision points. The Division of Statistics in co-operation with the Education Sector of UNESCO had acted imaginatively in providing this opportunity for intimate dialogue. Given the opportunities provided, now was the time to engage in a close and critical analysis of possibilities in conjunction with statisticians. Otherwise statisticians would have to make the necessary choices without the guidance which could ideally have been made available at a critical time. The current meeting had given some useful guidelines, and he suggested that the Division of Statistics intensify its efforts to stimulate critical and engaged dialogue on these momentous choices.

The meeting was informed that the special questionnaire on basic education had been designed and distributed by the Division of Statistics as a response to the World Conference on Education for All. The data collected by this questionnaire would be available for the 1993 World Education Report. The Division would welcome suggestions on priority items or on ways of analyzing or presenting the data. Looking to the possibility that this questionnaire might be issued again in the future and that some of the "successful" questions might be incorporated to the regular questionnaire, participants, who expressed appreciation at the emphasis given in the questionnaire to important qualitative dimensions, made a number of suggestions for possible modifications.

During the discussion on long-term options, one participant suggested that work should be initiated within UNESCO to operationalize the Jomtien document. This in itself could give a critical new focus to influence the design of information systems and related indicator development. Further work in the area of literacy was also essential. This would initially have to be experimental in character and at the research level in view of the difficulties already experienced in attempts to operationalize it. If successful, the results could possibly be used to measure key aspects of school outcomes. Reference to the existing IEA study was made and hopes were expressed that it could be helpful in future research effort. A similar approach would probably also have to be taken in the context of the importance of "measuring" learning achievements. This was particularly difficult when the results were used at the policy level. Any attempt to use results in this area to identify efficient suppliers of relevant services, would have to take background, and community factors into account and in effect develop a "measure" of a net concept of achievement, to be useful to clients or fair to suppliers.

The importance of training activities, especially at regional level, was stressed. This had two aspects: the identification and measurement of training activities in member countries and the possibility that UNESCO could form a perception of training needs, especially in the area of design and implementation of information systems and generate material and prospects.

The suggestion in the discussion document that national publications be investigated systematically to identify useful indicators was widely endorsed as was the suggestion that countries be invited to publish key indicators in one or more of a number of widely known languages.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Attention was drawn to the increasing emphasis on the importance of quality in all education systems. While the work done by IEA, IEPA and the other research organizations provided a good starting point, it was evident that further research work would be required in some areas before a number of relevant issues could be covered in regular questionnaires. What could be done without further research should be evaluated for priority inclusion in such questionnaires.

The need for data on language(s) and script(s) used in a variety of educational activities was stressed again. While this question affected some countries more than others, the critical importance of language (and script) for communication required special attention.

One participant drew attention to the difficulty of getting data on conceptually simple but critically important issues and said the need for improvement in these areas should not be overlooked. He instanced such items as number of days attended as an example. More generally time spent and key aspects of curricula offered and accepted were equally important.

Further information about the uses made of UNESCO and other indicators by decision makers, was required. The possibility that there were important and potentially damaging feed-back loops from inadequate or misinterpreted indicator systems, to resource allocation and other activities, needs to be investigated. Mr Hyland mentioned the concept of a client survey referred to in the discussion paper and he said that what he had in mind could be referred to as a "tagged" survey. Respondents could be tagged in terms of the "hats" they were wearing and this data would be essential in evaluating replies.

The question of evaluating and improving the need for accuracy in the data was revisited. The suggestion was made that it would be better to inform respondents not to provide data which were too inaccurate or too irrelevant and to notify UNESCO to this effect. Participants recognized that improving accuracy and relevance sometimes had a political dimension and almost always required additional resources; it was nevertheless essential to begin such improvements.

References were made to various ongoing research projects in several regions and the hope was expressed that data from these projects as well as methodological and conceptual improvement associated with them, would be available in time to be taken into account in the 1993 World Education Report.

Mr Smyth expressed satisfaction from his point of view with the organization and the outcome of the meeting. He said he believed that a meeting of a similar kind early next year in the context of the 1993 World Education Report would be even more useful. It would be sufficiently ahead in time of the drafting of that report to exercise a great influence on it and on the data presented in it.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE